

1 EDWARD R. REINES (Bar No. 135930)
2 edward.reines@weil.com
3 DAVID D. LYDON (Bar No. 270940)
4 david.lydon@weil.com
5 WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
6 Silicon Valley Office
7 201 Redwood Shores Parkway
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 802-3000
Facsimile: (650) 802-3100

6
7 *Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant*
O2 MICRO INTERNATIONAL LIMITED

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 OAKLAND DIVISION

11 MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.,

Case No. C 08-4567-CW

12 Plaintiff,

STATEMENT OF AUTHORITY
CONCERNING O2 MICRO
INTERNATIONAL LIMITED'S
OPPOSITION TO MPS AND
ASUSTEK'S MOTION FOR
ATTORNEYS' FEES, PURSUANT TO
THE COURT'S MARCH 3, 2011 ORDER
[DOCKET NO. 449]

13 v.

14 O2 MICRO INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,

15 Defendant.

16 O2 MICRO INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,

17 Counterclaimant,

18 v.

19 MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.,
20 ASUSTEK COMPUTER, INC., ASUSTEK
21 COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL AMERICA,

Judge: Honorable Claudia Wilken

22 Counterclaim-Defendants.

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-3(d), O2 Micro International Limited (“O2 Micro”)
2 brings to the Court’s attention the Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Fox v. Vice*, 2011 WL
3 2175211 (June 6, 2011) (“the trial court must determine whether the fees requested would not
4 have accrued but for the frivolous claim.”). This decision, which is attached, supports the
5 arguments made throughout O2 Micro’s Opposition to MPS and Asustek’s Motion for Attorneys’
6 Fees, Pursuant to the Court’s March 3, 2011 Order [Docket No. 449].

7 Dated: June 16, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

9 By: /s/ Edward R. Reines
10 Edward R. Reines

11 WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
12 Silicon Valley Office
13 201 Redwood Shores Parkway
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 802-3000

14 *Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant*
O2 Micro International Limited

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28